



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## JE in the Middle Books of the Pentateuch.

III. *From Egypt to Sinai:*Analysis of Exodus xii. 37—xvii. 16.<sup>1</sup>

BENJAMIN WISNER BACON.

OSWEGO, N. Y.

BY common consent, the element P in Ex. xii. 37—xiii. 22 comprises only xii. 40 f., 43–51; xiii. 1 f., 20. A few critics add, doubtfully, xii. 37<sup>a</sup>, on account of **מֵרַעַמְסֵם**. But with P Raamses is a “land” (Gen. xlvii. 11), not a city; and as Dillmann observes, P would have said, not **סִכְתֵּה**, but **וַיֵּצֵאוּ בְּסִכְתֵּה**. If **מֵרַעַמְסֵם** be not a mere addition of R it is the Rameses of J, i. 11 which is meant.

P's narrative, the fulfilment of xii. 12 f. and the indispensable ground for the law of the first-born, xiii. 1 f., is missing. It has for once been sacrificed by R in favor of the more vivid narrative of J. It may perhaps be restored with some confidence from the late document, Num. xxxiii. Here vs. 3 and 4 furnish part of the connecting links between Ex. xii. 12 f.; xiii. 1 f.; and xiv. 8<sup>b</sup>. In P, accordingly, the exodus took place not, as related by J (xii. 30 ff.), at midnight of the 14th, under compulsion of the Egyptians; but deliberately, after having celebrated the passover according to the legal requirement, none having ventured out of doors until the morning. Then, on the morning of the 15th, “on the morrow after the passover, the children of Israel went out with an high hand, in the sight of all the Egyptians, while the Egyptians were burying all their first-born which Yahweh had smitten among them: upon their gods also Yahweh executed judgments.” Such was the promise of xii. 12 f., but how it was accomplished we can only conjecture from Num. xxxiii. That the missing account of P contained the specific date 15th Nisan is implied in vs. 40 f. After this comes appropriately the brief ordinance of xiii. 1 f., “Sanctify unto me the first-born”;

<sup>1</sup> See JOURNAL, Vol. IX. 161–200; X. 107–130.

and, finally, the date of the Egyptian sojourn and of the Exodus, xii. 40 f., with the statistics of encampments, xiii. 20.

It is manifest from the foregoing, which makes "the morrow after the passover" the true date of the Exodus according to P, that xii. 42, which some are singularly inclined to attribute to P, must be from JE. This might, indeed, be gathered from language and style, for P has no archæological interest; moreover he does not *recommend* observances, he decrees them. Here is not only archæological interest, but a recommendation of ritual observance much more akin to the semi-priestly J than to E.<sup>2</sup>

No trace of E appears in this section until xiii. 17-19, which follows directly upon xii. 35 f. The imaginary traces of E in xii. 37 f. rest upon the relation with Num. xi. 4, 21, which should be assigned to J. E does not contemplate a vast, disorderly "mixed" multitude, but a comparatively small number (xiii. 17; xvii. 8 ff.) in battle array (xiii. 18).

The relation of xiii. 3-10, 11-16 to J is apparent (see vs. 5, 12, 15). E has no ritual interest. These "prophetic" parallels to P's laws of *mazzoth* and firstlings (xii. 15-20, 28; xiii. 1 f.) have been drastically worked over and expanded by D<sup>2</sup> (vs. 3, 8-10, 14-16), but have the ætiological form of J's legislation and many of J's linguistic peculiarities (*cf. e.g.* xiii. 5 with iii. 8). Ch. xxxiv. 18 (J) refers back to xiii. 3 ff.<sup>3</sup>

The celebrated Elohim passage, xiii. 17-19, needs no defence as part of E's most primitive material, a genuine old boulder of archaic tradition, forming an invaluable middle link between Gen. i. 25 and Josh. xxiv. 32. It is worthy of note that here the objective point of the Exodus is not the place in the wilderness, distant three days' journey, where they are to "serve Yahweh," — for Moses has not

<sup>2</sup> Budde, *ZATW.* XI. 200, rejects vs. 42 . on account of לָרִתִּים, as a Deuteronomic gloss, and translates: "A night of watching was this for Yahweh, when he brought them out of the land of Egypt." *Cf.* Reuss, *La Bible*; and LXX. and Vulg. *in loco*.

<sup>3</sup> Since writing the above I have received Dr. K. Budde's analysis of this section in the article referred to above (*ZATW.* XI. 193-234). Further proof is thereby made the more unnecessary. Dr. Budde gives precisely the same account of these legal sections, but further associates with them the kindred section xii. 21-27, the basis of which, on account of 22<sup>b</sup> and the apparent implication of an intermingling of the dwellings of Hebrews and Egyptians, I felt obliged, in the first article of this series, to assign to E. These obstacles Budde removes in a sufficiently satisfactory way, and I therefore fully coincide with his judgment as to all three legal sections, regarding them as J's with Deuteronomic expansion.

taken up the bones of Joseph for a feast in the wilderness, — but distinctly and unreservedly Canaan, the nearest way to which is by the land of the Philistines. Thus the route which leads to Horeb “by the way of the wilderness by the Red Sea” is an afterthought, and the “service” of Yahweh there incidental. It follows that, unless we are willing to find Moses guilty of deliberate falsehood, the last clause of v. 1, already declared suspicious (JOURNAL, X. (1891), 129), must be rejected. If retained, Moses is made not only wilfully to deceive Pharaoh, but to exceed his instructions. (See iii. 10 f. (19 f.?), 20 f., where surely there is no thought of a mere temporary leave of absence, and the feast at Horeb is incidental, as here; otherwise the borrowing of the jewels is no “spoiling of the Egyptians.”) In J, which appears to represent an older tradition, the demand of leave to go “three days’ journey into the wilderness to hold a feast to Yahweh” is sincere on Moses’ part, but in the course of the negotiations Pharaoh becomes so exasperated that he drives them out for good and all, xii. 39, declaring to Moses: “Take heed to thyself, see my face no more, for in the day thou seest my face thou shalt die.” After Moses’ reply, xi. 4–8, Pharaoh and his servants have no idea that Israel intends to return after being driven out. It is a case where temper gets the mastery. At dead of night Israel is bidden, “Begone, bag and baggage, and never come back.” In xiv. 5 temper has cooled off. Dillmann’s interpretation of the phrase, “What is this that we have done, that we have let Israel go from serving us?” seems to me unnatural. There is no *arrière pensée*, “Once out of Egypt, Israel will not return.” They had “let Israel go from serving them” intentionally, though in a rage; but second thoughts convince them that they have lost a good servant.

Again it follows from the distinctness with which the objective point of Canaan is presented in xiii. 17 ff. that E’s Horeb must be sought, not in the extreme south of the peninsula, where Sinai is generally located, but on the *next* nearest route to Palestine (*via* Kadesh), after that through the land of the Philistines. If the nearest road was only abandoned for cause (the visit to Horeb being no factor in the choice), then the author must have given some reason not easy to imagine nor likely to have been editorially eliminated, for any deviation from that *next* nearest route. This departure of Israel with the land of their fathers (Shechem, Gen. xlviii. 22) as the objective point *ab initio*, is characteristic of E. Cf. Gen. i. 25; Ex. iii. 10 f., 21 f. (cf. xi. 1–3; xii. 35 f., and the explanation of the “favor” shown

by the Egyptian women, JOURNAL, X. (1890), 198 f.) ; v. 1, except last clause, 2 ; xi. 1-3 ; xii. 31<sup>a</sup>, 35 f. ; xiii. 17-19.

In both J and E Israel goes out for good and all with what they can carry on their persons ; in E, the women, their — that is, their neighbors' — jewels ; the men, their arms and the bones of Joseph. In J, the women take household utensils and dough for *mazzoth* ; the men, their flocks and herds.

According to Kuenen (*Hexateuch*, § 8, n. 12), in xiii. 21 f. ; xiv. 19 f., we have E only, because the pillar of fire and cloud is the indispensable explanation of the statement about "the angel of Elohim" in v. 19<sup>a</sup> [hence the division of this verse is unwarranted], and "the angel" must be identified with "the pillar." This reasoning makes shipwreck on the subsequent synopsis by E of this narrative in Josh. xxiv. 7, where the angel is certainly not regarded as identical with the pillar, though a manifestation of the angel as cloud and darkness is not excluded. In accordance with Josh. xxiv. 7, we must divide as follows : xiii. 17 f. ; xiv. 10<sup>b</sup>, 19<sup>a</sup>, 20 to וְשָׁנָה, characterized (except in 10<sup>b</sup>) by אֱלֹהִים = E. *Darkness* is the wall of protection against Egypt, because the crossing takes place by daylight. In xiv. 20 we have a corrupt text rendered by the Septuagint, καὶ ἐγένετο σκότος καὶ γνόφος. This is perhaps parallel to xiii. 21 f. ; xiv. 10<sup>a</sup>, 19<sup>b</sup>, 20 (from וַיֵּאָר), characterized by יְהוָה = J. *Light* (lightning?) is here the protecting barrier, because the crossing takes place by night (20<sup>b</sup>, 21, 24).

In ch. xiv. there is little that can be added to the minute and careful analysis of Dillmann, generally followed by Jülicher. Wellhausen's attempt to rescue from the text the narrative of E at the expense of P must be pronounced unsuccessful. At only one point does it seem to me that Dillmann fails to improve upon it. Verse 3 seems to Wellhausen unlike the style and thought of P ; and for this conviction Jülicher has strong commendation, though he seems to reject the result, finding no place in J or E for the fragment. "Nur Vs. 3," says Jülicher, "macht einige Sorge, der übrigens zwischen 2 und 4 fast so gut fehlen wie stehen kann. Die Reflexion Pharao's darin ist fast zu natürlich. Was interessirt es den Q, wie Pharao denkt? Genug dass Gott ihn verstockt und in's Verderben treibt . . . ; psychologische d. h. menschliche Vermittlungen für Pharao's Thun und Lassen aufzusuchen, scheint Q sonst kleinlich." The reflection is justified, and from Jülicher's point of view and in its present form, it is also true that in JE there is no room for the verse. But if it be understood, as we have argued, that in E liberation is

Moses' demand *ab initio*, granted by Pharaoh in xiii. 17, we miss something before the story of pursuit to account for Pharaoh's change of mind. In short, the *Motivierung* of xiv. 3, which is superfluous to P and excluded by J (vs. 5), is essential to E. For וַאֲמַר in xiv. 3 read וַיֹּאמֶר, and connect with xiii. 17-19: . . . "God led the people [not by the nearest way but] about by the way of the wilderness by the Red Sea. . . . And Pharaoh said . . . They are entangled in the land, the wilderness hath shut them in. . . . And he took six hundred chosen chariots, and captains over all of them [and pursued after them]." This analysis is advanced with a marked "peradventure" as perhaps hazardous; however, neither its acceptance or rejection makes any difference with the analysis elsewhere.

In substantial agreement with Dillmann and Jülicher we accordingly assign to P in ch. xiv. vs. 1 f., 4, 8 f.\*, 15-18 (except מִהָתַעַק אֱלֹהֵי in vs. 15; and הָרַם אֶת מִטְךָ in vs. 16), 21 first and last clauses, 22 f., 26, 27 first clause, 28<sup>a</sup>, 29 (or 29 = R). J = xiv. 5 f., 7 middle clause, 10<sup>a</sup>, 11-14, 19<sup>b</sup>, 20, from וַיֹּאמֶר, 21 except first and last clauses, 24 f. (except last clause of 24 and first of 25), 27 except first clause, 28 last clause, 30 f.<sup>4</sup>

E's narrative can best be recovered from the brief statement, Josh. xxiv. 6 f. The fragments which remain here are xiv. 3 (trace in 8 f.? cf. Josh. xxiv. 6), 10 last clause, 19, 20 as far as הַשֵּׁךְ, ["and they came unto the sea" (Josh. xxiv. 6), "and Moses cried out unto Yahweh" (vs. 15)], 15 מִהָתַעַק אֱלֹהֵי, 16 הָרַם אֶת־מִטְךָ [. . .], 24 last clause, 25 first clause, ["and brought the sea upon them and covered them" (Josh. xxiv. 7)]. From this it does not appear just what the deliverance effected by Moses' rod was. Presumably the miracle was substantially as in P, not a mere providential ebb of the tide exposing the shoals through the effect of the strong wind, as in J; but an actual division of the floods, as in P. This conclusion is confirmed by the apparent allusion in Is. x. 26, "as his rod was over the sea," etc.

The extraordinary and unaccountable eccentricities of the route as delineated on the maps of modern expositors, with purposeless marches and countermarches, appears to be the result mainly of a modification of the tradition in the hands of its three narrators. In J Moses and Israel come to the Red Sea as if they expected to go by this route from the first. In xiv. 10-14 they anticipate no difficulty

<sup>4</sup> Vs. 31<sup>a</sup> from the reduplication of the thought, as well as repetition of the subject, of the preceding clause, might well be assigned to E. Cf. iii. 19; vi. 1, and Gen. xx. 11; xlii. 18; Ex. i. 17, 21; Josh. xxiv. 14.

in crossing, until the pursuers appear to embarrass the proceeding. It is as if at Succoth (Tell-el-Maskhutah) they had left the usual high-road which then passed over the fortified neck of El-Gisir, doubtless not far from the site of the celebrated fortress of Khetam (= Etham? = Shur?), swerving to the south for the purpose of effecting a crossing over the lagoons and marshes then extending northward from the Gulf of Suez to the Bitter Lakes or even to Lake Timsah, a passage then unguarded, because impassable to any but the semi-nomadic tribes of the neighborhood acquainted with the fords and shallows. The crossing, practicable in case of need to fugitives familiar with the ground, is suddenly made impracticable by the unexpected appearance of the pursuers; but providential aid facilitates the passage of Israel through the night, obstructing that of Egypt, till in the morning the pursuers, embarrassed among the shoals and quicksands, unfamiliar with the ground, threatened by the rapid rise of the tide, their van exposed to attack by Israel at extreme disadvantage, are finally beaten back in confusion by the fugitives. Yahweh fought for Israel, turned back the pursuers, shook them off in the Sea of Reeds; not one remained to harass; and Israel saw the bodies of the slain cast up on the sea-shore.

In E there is specific reason given for the swerving to the south. "God led them about by the way of the wilderness by the Red Sea," to avoid war. To all appearance they are in a *cul de sac*. Pharaoh sees hope of compelling submission and pursues. Israel cries to Yahweh. The angel of God comes between pursuers and pursued, and becomes a cloud and darkness. Moses cries to God, and is directed to open by the rod a miraculous passage whereby Israel escapes, and Egypt is overwhelmed. Here the *détour* is more accentuated, becoming an essential feature of the story, though by no means implying a needless return of the fugitives upon their own tracks.

In P, xiii. 20, Israel's escape is already complete, for they are encamped "in Etham in the edge of the wilderness." But Yahweh purposes to "get himself glory upon Pharaoh and all his host"; hence the fugitives are directed to "turn back" and place themselves in an inviting position for Egyptian attack, "before Pi-hahiroth, between Migdol and the Sea opposite Baal Zephon." In his usual artificial, mechanical, and unimaginative style the priestly writer then relates how "Yahweh got him glory upon Pharaoh and his host." The transition from history to theology could hardly be better illustrated. E stands midway between J and P. The change of route

has now become an extraordinary, yet deliberate, countermarch; but its historical motive has entirely disappeared, displaced by a purely theological one. Historical interest has suffered total eclipse from dogmatic.

In regard to the psalm, xv. 2-18, the main point I would establish is that vs. 1 and 20 f. are not mutually supplementary, but parallel. As Jülicher has shown, vs. 20 f. can stand alone, and the responsive singing was originally intended of Miriam and the women only (*cf.* LXX and Vulg., *quibus praecinebat*). Passages analogous to vs. 20 f. exist in Jud. xi. 34, and in 1 Sam. xviii. 7 and related passages. Of these Budde (*Richter und Samuel*) assigns the former, doubtfully, to E, the latter to J. I incline to think with Dillmann that the mention of Miriam as "the prophetess, the sister of Aaron" (*cf.* Num. xi. 24-26; xii. 2, 6) is decisive in favor of E, and that it refers to the data in regard to Moses' family which originally were connected with ii. 1. The assigning of vs. 1 to J is a consequence which I am the more ready to accept, because I expect to show independently that Num. xxi. 17, which employs the same form of introduction for a poetic fragment, is from this source. I agree with Jülicher in thinking that the psalm, vs. 2-18, or at least its incorporation, is later than the union of J and E. For the linguistic argument the reader must choose between Dillmann and Jülicher *in loc.* But I cannot agree that "vs. 1-18 sind aus einem Guss," nor does it seem to me probable that the psalm is as late as Deuteronomy.

If, as Jülicher maintains, the psalm was written "by Rj" as an expansive gloss to vs. 21<sup>b</sup> (Jül. B., p. 126), why do we not find it attached to that verse, instead of introduced at an earlier point? and why were the opening lines repeated, or if repeated, why altered in form and introduction, and put in the mouth of Moses and the children of Israel, instead of Miriam, as in vs. 20 f.? But it is of more consequence to observe that vs. 1 distinctly shows the marks of *not* being *aus einem Guss* with 2-18. Vs. 2-10 simply repeat and expand the thought of 1<sup>b</sup>. Vs. 1 uses **רָמָה**; vs. 4 uses **יָרָה**. Moreover, as Dillmann notices (p. 153), the first lines are five-toned, the later four-toned.

But we have external evidence for supposing that the psalm begins with vs. 2. Is. xii. is perhaps exilic or post-exilic (see JOURNAL, IX. (1890), 128 ff.), but its author, in enumerating certain appropriate psalms or songs, is much more likely to mention them by their *first* lines than by their third or fourth, and he mentions among others our psalm by the lines of vs. 2<sup>a</sup>.



Let it be granted that the psalm, vs. 2-18, goes far beyond the limits of the situation, so much so as to be more appropriate to Solomon's time (*cf.* vs. 13 and 17); and that it must have been an incorporation after the union of J and E (*cf.* vs. 8 and 10 with ch. xiv.); it cannot have been much later, on account of Is. xii. 2, and perhaps even more markedly on account of Is. xi. 11 (*cf.* vs. 16), in connection with the references to E in x. 24, 26; and it must have had some point of attachment. This point of attachment was not vs. 20 f.; we can only suppose that it was vs. 1, which stood in the combined narrative of JE immediately before vs. 20 f., and the latter, accordingly, JE<sup>r</sup> wished to be understood, as it now is, as a response (vs. 21 "answered them") by the women to vs. 1, instead of in the sense of 1 Sam. xviii. 6-8.

The passage xv. 22-25<sup>a</sup> may be assigned with confidence to J. With 22<sup>a</sup> *cf.* xiii. 17 f.; with 22<sup>b</sup>, the series of J passages iii. 18, v. 3, etc.; with 23<sup>b</sup>, Gen. xi. 8, xvi. 14, xix. 22, etc. The use of physical means (not the rod of God) further characterizes 22-25<sup>a</sup> as J's. Vs. 27 must be assigned to the same source. With the first clause *cf.* vs. 23, with עֵינַת מַיִם *cf.* Gen. xvi. 7. Vs. 25<sup>b</sup>, on the other hand, cannot be connected with 25<sup>a</sup>. The attempt involves confusion in the sentence, for it appears from vs. 26 that the subject in 25<sup>b</sup> is Yahweh, and not, as in the preceding verb, Moses. Again, it is not apparent why Marah should be the scene of legal enactments, nor, indeed, why the locality should be thus emphasized. Jülicher well says of this half-verse that it can only have been written by the author of Josh. xxiv. 25, but he is certainly wrong in designating this author as R<sup>d</sup> instead of E. In corroboration of this judgment observe that it is universally E who depicts Yahweh as proving his people. *Cf.* Gen. xxii. 1; Ex. xvi. 4 (E); xx. 20; Dt. xxxiii. 8. In the last-named passage we have a reference to a proving of Israel by Yahweh, *cf.* for the subject "thou" in vs. 8, vs. 7 and 9, and for the "beloved one," vs. 3, where Yahweh's beloved is "the tribes"; but also vs. 12, 8 f., where it appears to be the priesthood, *i.e.* Levi, the tribe of Moses), which nowhere appears in the E document as we have it. The locality, however, is Massah; the 'proving' being a play upon the name regarded as derived from נִסָּה, 'tempt, prove.' In xvii. 7, the name of this locality is derived from a tempting of Yahweh by Israel; hence the Massah story there given can only be J's parallel to the missing narrative of E, which inverted the terms. But we have only to observe that the verb of Ex. xv. 25<sup>b</sup> is this same characteristic verb נִסָּה, to perceive at once that the locality to which שָׁם

at the beginning of the half-verse is vainly attempting to direct us, is this very Massah. The statement was one of E's characteristic brief ætiological notices like Gen. xxxv. 7; Dt. x. 6-8. The blind way in which 25<sup>b</sup> now stands attached to 25<sup>a</sup> is thus explained, and at the same time we are enabled to reconstruct the lost clause. Its subject was Elohim (or Yahweh), its object "the people"; and it told of the arrival at Massah. ["And God led the people onward (from the Red Sea?) unto Massah ('Proving')"]. There he made for them a statute and an ordinance, and there he proved them."<sup>5</sup>

Vs. 26 is universally recognized as Deuteronomistic, a characteristic interpolation of pure didactic generalities, apparently designed to round off the abrupt termination of 25<sup>b</sup>.

But we are by no means through with xv. 25<sup>b</sup>. It does not yet appear why its head should have been amputated, unless, perhaps, to avoid collision with xvii. 7, or why it should terminate so abruptly. We have, however, only to eliminate the elements foreign to E, viz. vs. 26 (D<sup>2</sup>), 27 (J), xvi. 1-3 (P), to find the missing sequel and the explanation of all. The next verse (xvi. 4 f.) goes on to describe the "ordinance" and the "proving" undergone by Israel precisely as we are led to expect by xv. 25<sup>b</sup>. It will be needful, however, in order to establish a claim for JE to any part of Ex. xvi. to enter the debate of Wellhausen and Kuenen on this chapter, and contribute, if possible, a decisive argument on the side of the former of these famous critics.

In his *Hexateuch*, § 16, n. 12, Kuenen makes the following *résumé* of his remarkable article in *Th. Tijdschrift*, XIV. 281-302: "It is certain that the basis of this chapter is taken entirely from P<sup>2</sup>, not even partially from JE (though Dillmann, p. 164 sqq., still defends this latter hypothesis); but the version in P<sup>2</sup> was shorter than the present form." To this conclusion Jülicher, *B.*, p. 279-294, lends his support. But Wellhausen, in an appendix to his *Composition des Hexateuchs*, 1889, pp. 323-327, opposes an emphatic demurrer. All

<sup>5</sup> Since the above analysis was formulated, Cornill, in *ZATW.* XI. 32, has taken the same view as the above of Ex. xv. 25<sup>b</sup>. The fact of the entire independence of the discovery on the part of two investigators is mentioned only by way of corroboration of the theory. I am able to verify it by referring to my notes on the first 20 chapters of Exodus, prepared before the appearance of Professor Cornill's article, for the *Genesis of Genesis*, given to the press in January, 1891, from which, however, the Exodus chapters were eliminated for lack of space. Professor Cornill adds to the E passages employing נִסָּה above referred to, Num. xiv. 22; Jud. ii. 22; iii. 1, 4 [D<sup>2</sup>?].

agree that the main part of the chapter is P<sup>2</sup> modified and expanded by P<sup>3</sup> or R; also, Jülicher excepted, that P<sup>2</sup>'s manna story must originally have followed, instead of preceding, the Sabbath legislation at Sinai (*cf.* vs. 23, 33, 34), the erection of the tabernacle (presupposed in vs. 9 "before Yahweh," and in vs. 10, where for מִדְבָּר of R read מִשְׁכָּן), and the institution of the "Testimony" (*cf.* vs. 33, 34).

Wellhausen urges that the displacement of P's narrative is unaccountable unless R brought it hither to combine with an earlier narrative of JE; shows that Num. xi. presupposes the actual use of manna according to JE from the beginning of the wilderness sojourn; and establishes a very strong case for duplicate sources in Ex. xvi. "Why, in fact," asks Wellhausen, "should P<sup>3</sup> undertake to rewrite P<sup>2</sup>'s story, introducing all sorts of palpable incongruities, if there was no incongruity there before?"

In my opinion Wellhausen's argument is a very strong one. Nevertheless it has points which admit at least of much reinforcement:

1. Wellhausen adverts (4) to the curious introduction of quails in vs. 3, 6-14 (P<sup>2</sup>), and contrasts it with the mention of bread only in vs. 4, 5, and the portions of xvi. assignable to JE. He does not seem, however, to notice the singularity of the introduction of the quails in P<sup>2</sup>'s account. In vs. 13 they literally drop out of the clouds. They come preceded by the definite article as if expected; but no one pays any attention to them. We are not told that any one expected them, saw them, touched them, caught them, ate them, noticed them in any way whatever. They might exactly as well not be there. We, who have the story of Num. xi. in mind, know what they are there for, and what the consequences were; but P<sup>2</sup>, after he has related that "at even *the* quails came up and covered the camp," becomes so much interested in the manna that he forgets all about the quails, and nothing more is heard from them. Yet he began his story with the intention of relating the evil consequences that came upon the people for their rebellious demand for bread *and flesh*. No such devout writer as P could possibly have begun his narrative with a detailed description of the sacrilegious murmuring of Israel, "not against Moses and Aaron, but against Yahweh" (vs. 7, 8<sup>b</sup>; *cf.* Num. xvi. 11), such as fills vs. 2 f., 6-11, unless he had *then* in mind certain direful consequences which would happen to Israel. But from vs. 13 on we wait in vain for the expected punishment. It does not come. On the contrary, the most remarkable possible evidence of Yahweh's favor is granted, and the quails which should have brought the plague are quietly dropped. The only thing which can explain this phe-

nomenon is the fact which also explains the failure of the ordinary reader to notice the singularity. The reference to the quails in vs. 13 recalls to his mind the story of Num. xi. and the plague of Kibroth-hattaawah; he goes on, with the *impression* that the demands of divine justice have been met, to relate the (to him) astonishing blessing of the manna, and forgets that the required punishment has not been actually related.

All this shows by implication what was the real reason for P's association of "*flesh*" ("quails," vs. 13) with the bread, though in vs. 4 and the sequel we have nothing to do with anything but the manna, and though even in Num. xi. the association in time is a literary accident. The real statement of J in Num. xi. is in harmony with that in Ex. xvi., that the manna was in use from the beginning, though J does not think it worth while to mention it until the quail incident at Kibroth leads him to explain what it was. We must remember that for J, and J alone, the dependence of Israel in the wilderness for food is *in the main just what it had been in Goshen*. They were keepers of cattle there, and they have brought their flocks and herds with them. If he regarded the manna in a purely natural light, as an edible product of the Peninsula, used by Israel in the desert as it was used in his own day by the tribes of that region, and is still used by them in our day to supplement a scanty fare (see Dillmann, *Exodus*, p. 176),—and there is not one word in all that relates to the manna in J to indicate that he thought of it in any other light than the modern manna-gatherer, who calls it *mann es-semā'*, "the gift of heaven," and believes it to be rained from the sky, but sees no *special* providence in it,—we can readily understand why he introduces the description as a mere episode to the quail story. The only adequate explanation of P's singular association of the manna and the quails *in time*, with the strange ignoring of the quails after vs. 13, is that he had before him, at least mentally, the narrative of Num. xi. Then, the relative importance of the manna and the quails being for him the reverse of J's, the quails a mere episode and the manna all-important, the former are readily dropped out of sight, and the section which opened with unmistakable resemblance to J's narrative of the plague sent on the murmurers for flesh (*cf.* Num. xi. 4), ends as an awe-struck description of the miraculous special gift of manna.

Whether, with the majority of critics, we regard this narrative of P<sup>2</sup> as displaced by R from the neighborhood of Num. xx., or, with Jülicher, consider that it was written from the beginning in the con-

nection of vs. 1, will depend on the disposition made of 9 f., 33 f., where the tabernacle, cloud, testimony, etc., are presupposed, and which Jülicher assigns to P<sup>3</sup>. In favor of the former it may be urged that in both J and E the giving of manna and water (food and drink) were closely associated in the order of the narrative (as will hereafter appear); that P's unmistakable dependence upon Num. xi. would lead him in adopting the quail story to place his own narrative of the manna in the same historical sequence, and that R, having a narrative before him (JE in Ex. xvi.), which, placing the same importance as P upon the manna as Israel's sole dependence, related it at the very outset, naturally preferred to remove P's for combination with JE in Ex. xvi. rather than JE's for combination with P in Numbers. In favor of the latter is the possibility that P might also be influenced by the consideration that it would be convenient for Israel to have something to eat during the first three months as well as later; the strong indications of P<sup>3</sup> throughout Ex. xvi., especially in vs. 6-10 and 22-34; and the elaborate date of vs. 1, which last, however, is capable of a different explanation (*infra*, p. 194 *sq.*).

That which is of supreme importance to criticism in the analysis of Ex. xvi. is the light thrown by it upon the relation of the sources J, E, and P, and here I even venture to think it will prove practically decisive. The test case in this question is the relation of P<sup>2</sup> to J, the relative antiquity of J and E being subordinate. In view of this it will not be superfluous to bring again the unmistakable and acknowledged J elements of Num. xi. and P<sup>2</sup> elements of Ex. xvi. side by side.

Num. xi. 4-6<sup>a</sup> (J; *cf.* Ex. xii. 38) = Ex. xvi. 2-3 (P<sup>2</sup>); Israel murmurs for the flesh-pots of Egypt. Num. xi. 6<sup>b</sup>-9 (J; *cf.* Gen. ii. 12) = Ex. xvi. 14, 23, 31 (P<sup>2</sup>; vs. 23 perhaps P<sup>3</sup>), a practically, in places verbally, identical description of the manna and its preparation. Num. xi. 13, 18-23, 31-34 (J; with vs. 21 *cf.* Ex. xii. 37; with vs. 31, Ex. x. 13; xiv. 21, 27) = Ex. xvi. 12 f. (P<sup>2</sup>); Yahweh promises flesh in conjunction with the manna, and sends a flight of quails.

Wellhausen, who is anxious to show the presence of J in Ex. xvi. denies (*Composition*, p. 324) that in Num. xi. 4 ff. J is speaking of the manna for the first time, on the *a priori* ground that he could not have neglected for so long a matter of such cardinal importance to Israel. Why he could, and did, we have already seen above (p. 187). Wellhausen's suggestion that Num. xi. 7 f. has been removed from an earlier place is not only unsupported by evidence,

but positively negated by the dependence of Ex. xvi. 12 f. on Num. xi. 4-9, etc., *in its present shape*.

That the narrative which introduces the manna as a mere episode, of natural origin, in a digression from the quail story, is not merely dependent on older sources than that which exalts the manna phenomenon after the style of Ex. xvi., but is actually *itself* a source for the latter, ought to be obvious from the above to every candid critic.

2. We have now to introduce the second link in our analysis, the narrative of E, the apparent absence of which has occasioned the overlooking of this important chain of literary development.

Wellhausen and Kuenen discuss with reciprocal acumen the relation of Deuteronomy to the question, so far at least as the *thought* of D is concerned. The discussion seems to establish the fact that D's *conception* of the manna is intermediate between JE as shown in Num. xi. and P<sup>2</sup> in Ex. xvi.; but as long as no actual use of any part of Ex. xvi. by D is shown, the mere demonstration of a more appreciative conception of the manna on D's part than that of Num. xi. 4 ff.; xxi. 5, is only a negative result. D *need* not have obtained his more appreciative idea from Ex. xvi.

If, however, we leave this somewhat intangible argument from the development of ideas, and scrutinize with care the *language* of Dt. viii. 2 f., 16, it will be possible to establish beyond reasonable doubt the fact that D had before him Ex. xvi. 4 and 15, and thus decisively settle the whole controversy, besides shedding a flood of light upon the further question of the relation of all the principal Hexateuchal sources to one another. Let us place the two passages side by side, comparing the elements of the narrative as they can be extracted from D's parenetic context. First as to motive:

Ex. xv. 25<sup>b</sup> (E).

"There [at Massah] he [Yahweh] made for them a statute and an ordinance and *there he proved them*."

XVI. 4.

"Then said Yahweh unto Moses, Behold I will rain bread from heaven for you, and the people shall go out and gather a day's portion every day, *that I may prove them, whether they will walk in my law or no*."

Dt. VIII. 2-16.

"Yahweh led thee all the way in the wilderness . . . that he might humble thee, *to prove thee*, to know what was in thine heart, *whether thou wouldst keep his commandments or no*. So he humbled thee and fed thee with manna." . . . 16 "Who fed thee in the wilderness with manna . . . that he might humble thee and *that he might prove thee*."

The connection between feeding with manna and "proving" is not so self-evident that this exhibition of a reason for D's association of the two can appear superfluous. But again, as to the second element of the story, the second etymology (after that of Massah from נסה) of manna from מן.

Ex. xvi. 15.

"And when the children of Israel [the fathers of the generation addressed in Dt. viii.] saw it, they said one to another, What is it (מן הוא), for they knew not what it was."

Dt. viii. 3.

. . . "Manna which thou knewest not, neither did thy fathers know."

Dt. viii. 16.

"Manna which thy fathers knew not."

Finally, as to the character and source of the manna, Dt. viii. 3 reminds Israel that Yahweh had thus taught them that "man doth not live by bread only, but by everything that proceedeth out of the mouth of Yahweh." In Ex. xvi. 4 the day's portion is a דבר; in xvi. 16, אשר צוה יהוה, הדבר; and in xvi. 23, "This is that which Yahweh hath spoken" (דבר; appointed?).

The resemblance in both thought and language, especially the allusion in Dt. viii. 3 and 16 to the two etymologies from נסה and מן, is such as, when coupled with the general dependence of D upon JE, makes it practically certain that Ex. xvi. 4 and 15 were known to D.

From this point on the analysis of Ex. xvi. is easy. The JE element is not J (Dill., Driver, Well.?) nor J + E, but E alone. This appears not merely from its connection with xv. 25<sup>b</sup> (E), and its motif as a "proving" of Israel and its consequent location at Massah (cf. xvii. 7<sup>a-c</sup> = J), but from the fact of its position, which has brought about the displacement of P's narrative, or at least of the quail elements in it; whereas J, though assuming the use of the manna from the beginning, did not mention it until the Kibroth-hattaawah incident.

The linguistic arguments of Jülicher and others, though otherwise intended, will be found only to corroborate the analysis to which we are thus driven.

Verse 1 is not, perhaps, the real heading to P's narrative, which, if vs. 10, 33 f. are accepted, was located beyond Sinai, doubtless at Kibroth-hattaawah, as in J (or, more generally, "in the wilderness of Paran"). The hand of R has been busy here modifying the date and location. On stylistic grounds I agree with Jülicher in assigning

the relative clause **אשר בין אילם ובין סיני** to R. The first clause is perhaps to be taken with the preceding verse (J), for reasons to be given later. The rest of the verse is in place and belongs to P<sup>2</sup>. In vs. 2 f. we have the displaced material of P<sup>2</sup>, taken from the neighborhood of Num. xiv. 1 f. and xx. 4, with which it is almost verbally identical. At the same time Num. xi. 4-6 (J) is followed closely enough to show its influence. The displacement of 6 f., where Moses and Aaron give the message of 11 f. before they have received it, is well-known (see Wellhausen, *Composition*, p. 325). The order must be 9-12, 6 f. Verse 8 is the very seal of R's handiwork, awkwardly attempting to mend the confusion; 8<sup>a</sup> seems to be prompted by the observation that in 6 f. Moses and Aaron have not communicated their message verbatim as given them in vs. 12, and supplements it with specific mention of the flesh and bread. Vs. 8<sup>b</sup> is a pure repetition of 7<sup>b</sup>. Cf. vi. 10-12, 28-30. The change of **משכן** to **מדבר** in vs. 10 could not fail to suggest itself to R. That it produced nonsense did not greatly concern him. The less obvious anachronisms of vs. 9 f., 33 f. he left standing. From vs. 13 on we have plain sailing as to order, but the inconsistencies noted by Wellhausen are not so readily reducible. In 13 f. we have P<sup>2</sup> still obviously dependent upon Num. xi. 7-9. In vs. 16, on the other hand, we have an inconsistency which has not only embarrassed the critics who maintain the unity of the narrative, but seems also to have caused anxiety to R. The command to gather "every man according to his eating" cannot be harmonized with that which prescribes exactly "an omer a head (**וגלגלת**; P) according to the number of your persons" (**נפשתיכם**; P), unless the appetite of each man should miraculously correspond exactly to one omer. But R is equal to the emergency. The miracle of 17 f. cuts the Gordian knot; but as it is of such a nature as to have no purpose or significance except to assist a harmonizer out of a difficulty, we may safely conclude that it originated with R. (Cf. Gen. xxvi. 15, 18.)

Verse 16<sup>a</sup>, however, furnishes really a doublet of 15<sup>b</sup> as well as of 16<sup>b</sup>. It is the answer to the question of Israel. Insert after 19<sup>a</sup>. E's narrative will then be found, so far as preserved, in 15<sup>a</sup>, 19<sup>a</sup>, 16<sup>a</sup>, 19<sup>b</sup>-21. What, then, was the "statute and ordinance" given at Massah (xv. 25<sup>b</sup>)? To the writer of vs. 5, 22-30 it is, of course, the Sabbath, but it does not appear to be at all clear to various other writers represented here what the ordinance for "proving" was. Verses 16, 23, and 32 contain three mutually exclusive representations of what the



thing was which Yahweh had commanded. In 16<sup>a</sup>, 19 ff. it is either the manna itself which is "appointed," or more probably an expansion of the command of vs. 4, דָּבַר יוֹם בְּיוֹמוֹ, teaching a daily dependence on God; vs. 4, in fact, taken by itself, implies that Yahweh intends to teach the lesson of *faith* through humble dependence for daily bread, "Give us each day our daily (needful) bread." This, again, is the conception of Dt. viii. 3, "humbled thee and suffered thee to hunger and fed thee," and 16, "fed thee with manna, that he might humble thee," etc., and is altogether characteristic of the religious, but not ritualistic, tone of E. In vs. 32 ff. "the thing which Yahweh commanded" is the characteristic interest of D, a remembrance to coming generations (*cf.* xii. 26; xiii. 8, 14, etc.). In vs. 23-30 "the thing which Yahweh commanded" is the preëminent interest of P, due observance of the Sabbath (*cf.* xxxi. 12-17; xxxv. 1-4, etc.). Neither of these latter interests, but especially the last, is such as we should expect to find in E. If he did not even stop at the Passover to promulgate laws, but left all to Horeb, it is not likely that he would pause at Massah to give a Sabbath ordinance. Moreover, the language of vs. 22 ff. is distinctly priestly. With 22<sup>a</sup> *cf.* 16<sup>b</sup>; with 23<sup>a</sup>, 26, and 25, *cf.* xxxi. 15, xxxv. 2, 4, and *P passim*; observe also the numbered days of the week, and in 22<sup>b</sup> the נִשְׂאֵי הַעֲדָה. A material difference between vs. 21 and 22 ff. is the melting of the manna in the heat of the sun, whereas in 23<sup>b</sup> it is prepared by baking and boiling. Another material incongruity hitherto unobserved is that between vs. 5, 16<sup>b</sup>, 22<sup>a</sup> on the one hand, and 16<sup>a</sup> and 21 on the other. The author of the latter cannot have spoken of doubling the quantity, for the original quantity is indefinite, determined only by the appetite of the gatherer. If he had had in mind a double allowance on Friday he would have been obliged to double the appetite of the gatherers Friday morning, and then halve it again when they got home to prevent the supply being all eaten. As soon as the ultra-ritualistic idea of a double supply on Friday to prevent the profanation of the Sabbath by so much as gathering manna is conceived, — an idea inconceivable in either prophetic writer, — the narrator is forced to alter the form of his story throughout, and fix a definite quantity as a day's portion, instead of bidding the gatherer consult his daily requirement. Here we have the whole explanation of the curious variation from the indefinite day's portion (vs. 4, E) to the *omer* of P, a word, by the way, which seems to be taken from Num. xi. 31 (J). It follows that vs. 5 is not a part of the original narrative of E, but belongs to a comparatively

late addition. This judgment, radical as it may seem, is at once confirmed by the relation of vs. 5 to 17 f. (R), since its understanding of the duplication obviously is, "after the manna is brought in it will be found to measure two omers instead of one," a miraculous increase. Again, vs. 5 regards the manna as needing to be prepared. So vs. 23 (P, in manifest dependence upon Num. xi. 8, J). Finally, vs. 4 is really complete without vs. 5, for if a Sabbath ordinance is that which is to test the obedience of the people, it should come before Yahweh's explanation of his intention "that I may prove them" in vs. 4.

Here, then, is the second stage of the manna story (E). Ex. xv. 25<sup>b</sup>; xvi. 4, 15<sup>a</sup>; "And Moses said to them" from vs. 19; 16<sup>a</sup>, 19<sup>b</sup>-21 (vs. 20 = R<sup>d</sup>?). To this must, of course, be added 35<sup>a</sup> (= 35<sup>b</sup>, P<sup>2</sup>; cf. Josh. v. 12). The Deuteronomist has rightly interpreted the story. He recognizes, indeed, from Num. xi. and xxi. that the manna was scanty fare, the object of which was to humble Israel and prove them, to know whether they would walk in Yahweh's law or no; still it is a heavenly gift of food. But only a day's supply is to be gathered at a time. Verse 20, which introduces apparently a different, quasi-ritualistic idea (cf. xxiii. 18; xxxiv. 25) as a reason for immediate consumption and leaves us uninformed of the results of Moses' wrath, is suspected by Jülicher, perhaps with reason. After the day's necessity is provided for, the rest disappears with the heat of the sun. So in daily dependence for manna Israel journeyed forty years. This conception, in contrast to that of J, is certainly secondary.

The longer narrative introducing a much more mechanical conception and miraculously avoiding a technical infringement of the Sabbath, is P. It is throughout dependent upon J, in places verbally; but in its conception of the manna as a divine gift it approaches nearer to E.

Taking up the analysis of P's narrative where we dropped the thread on page 186, vs. 15<sup>b</sup> refers the people to the promise of "bread"; vs. 12 is therefore from P<sup>2</sup>; 16<sup>b</sup> belongs linguistically to P (p. 191); 17 f. (from וַיִּלְקְטוּ) = R; 22 f. is thoroughly priestly both in thought and language. Verse 24, while dependent upon vs. 20, differs from it in language (Wellhausen, Jülicher), and appears to be secondary; 25 f. are unmistakably priestly (see above, p. 192). Verses 27 f. seem to interrupt the connection of 26 and 29. The object, of course, is to confirm Moses' prediction in vs. 26; but the language of vs. 28 is in every word unmistakably Deuteronomic (see Jülicher), and it apparently introduces Yahweh as the speaker, whereas in vs. 29 Moses appears to be still speaking in continuation of vs. 26.

If so, 29 f. goes with 25 f. and 27 f. = R<sup>d</sup>. If not, 27-30 = R<sup>d</sup> (Jülicher). Verse 31 = P<sup>2</sup>; it is parallel to 15<sup>a</sup> and verbally dependent on Num. xi. 7 f. Verse 32 is Deuteronomic in style and language (Jülicher); 33 f. is perhaps from the same hand (Jülicher), otherwise purely priestly; vs. 35<sup>b</sup> = P<sup>2</sup>; 36 belongs with vs. 5, 16<sup>b</sup>, 22-30, 32-34.

The assignment of this latter series of verses to P by no means implies that they belong to P<sup>2</sup>. On the contrary, they are of the nature of a *Haggada* intended to modify an original manna story in which no special provision was made for the Sabbath, in such a manner as to avoid the technical breach of the law by gathering manna (*cf.* Num. xv. 32 ff.). Such legal refinements are the special sphere of P<sup>3</sup>. Now in many ways the narrative of P<sup>2</sup> will be clearer and more intelligible if from 13 f. on we eliminate all but 15<sup>b</sup>, 31, 35<sup>b</sup>. Verses 27 f. and 32 (27-30, 32-34?) belong to the late post-exilic R<sup>d</sup> (see Jülicher, pp. 289, 291), and have a purely didactic interest. But vs. 5, 16<sup>b</sup>-18, 22-26 (-30?) have a ritual, legalistic interest, and are written to fit the already combined narrative of P + E (see vs. 5, 16<sup>b</sup>, 17 f., 22, 29; and *cf.* 24 with 20). Moreover, this Sabbatic element is not quite in accord with P<sup>2</sup>. The preparation of the manna, vs. 5, 23<sup>b</sup>, is derived from Num. xi. 8, but P<sup>2</sup> does not seem disposed to accept this idea of the manna. For him it is heavenly "bread" (15<sup>b</sup>), and not only edible but a delicacy in its unprepared state (vs. 31). On all accounts there is the strongest reason for regarding the Sabbatic element vs. 5, 16<sup>b</sup>-18, 22-30 as P<sup>3</sup>; 17 f. is perhaps still later; and this judgment is confirmed by the improved connection which results for P<sup>2</sup> by their elimination.

Passing over the mere allusions of D to E, the third phase of the manna story is therefore that of P<sup>2</sup> in Ex. xvi. 2 f., 9-12, 6-8\*, 13 f., 15<sup>b</sup>, 31, 35<sup>b</sup>. The dependence of P<sup>2</sup> upon J has been shown at length. His dependence upon E is not disputed. To these clearly-marked superimposed strata of tradition it is not necessary to add the didactic and ritualistic supplementations of R<sup>d</sup> and P<sup>3</sup>.

The opening lines of chapter xvii. belong to the unmistakable framework of P<sup>2</sup>, and connect perhaps directly with xvi. 1, consideration of which was postponed above. If we turn to the late chapter, Num. xxxiii., we find a curious phenomenon in vs. 10 f., not to be accounted for by anything now found in Exodus. "The Red Sea" as one of Israel's stations between Elim and Rephidim is almost unaccountable; for the only station of that name known to Exodus is that of xv. 22. But there is an obvious gap in P's

narrative before xvi. 1 which we are by no means obliged to fill out in imitation of the author of Num. xxxiii., by supposing the missing material to have been identical with the data of JE in xv. 22-27. On the contrary, if we ask whence P<sup>3</sup> in Num. xxxiii. obtained this curious and misfitting datum of "the Red Sea" for the station preceding "the wilderness of Sin," the most likely place conceivable is P<sup>2</sup>'s narrative in this identical connection, only that in the original connection its sense was parallel to xv. 22. If in fact we simply use Num. xxxiii. 11 to supply the gap in P before Ex. xvi. 1, we both account for the phenomenon in Num. xxxiii. and complete the P narrative with equal satisfaction. The first clause of Ex. xvi. 1 must then either be connected with the preceding (J), or we must suppose an original **יָם סוּף** to have been altered by R to **אֵילָם** subsequent to Num. xxxiii. The latter is perhaps the more probable conjecture. This would confirm, of course, Jülicher's rejection of the clause **אֲשֶׁר בֵּין יוֹנָי**. Ex. xvi. 1 marks the end of the first month of the exodus (cf. xii. 40 f., 51); xix. 1 f. marks the end of the second, the 15th day of the third month. Here, as in the Flood-chronology of P, the months are of 30 days each.<sup>6</sup> Ex. xvii. 1<sup>a</sup> is universally and justly assigned by critics to P<sup>2</sup>, though from the mention of a specific locality, contrary to his usage where no special event is related (cf. Num. x. 12; xii. 16; xx. 1), we may infer that some datum in regard to Rephidim is now missing.

The displacement of xvii. 8-16, which in its original E connection must have stood much later, may be accounted for by its location at Rephidim. It is clear that according to P, xvii. 1; xix. 2, Rephidim is on the hither side of Sinai from Egypt; but according to E on the further side of Horeb. R has, as usual, sacrificed E's arrangement to P's. Probably we should not identify Horeb and Sinai; but xvii. 8-16 is certainly E's, and yet belongs later than xxiv. 13 and xxxiii. 11. Joshua, Aaron, and Hur, "the rod of God," and the linguistic marks (e.g. **חֹלֶשׁ נֹכַח**, vs. 13, cf. xxxii. 18) make out a case which Jülicher vainly struggles to weaken. Neither has his attempt to divide the paragraph an adequate foundation. Verses 15, 16<sup>a</sup>, instead of showing any trace of J (Jül., *B.*, p. 273), are purely in the style of E. Cf. Gen. xxxiii. 20; xxxv. 7. **יְהוָה** is permissible since Ex. iii.; and, while E still preserves the Elohim of his principal source in technical terms such as "rod of Elohim," vs. 9, we are

<sup>6</sup> See my articles on the Flood-chronology of P in *Hebraica*, VIII., 1892, p. 83.

not to expect that he will use it in what he writes *de suo*. Thus much we may grant to Jülicher, that vs. 14-16 represent E himself more directly than vs. 8-13, which is the material derived from his source. This source may even be referred to in vs. 14, but 8-13 as a whole belongs simply to E.

It is, however, impossible to suppose that Joshua and Hur can really be introduced here for the first time in E's narrative, and *afterwards* presented to the reader in Ex. xxiv. 13 f.; xxxiii. 11; Num. xi. 28, with an explanation of who they are. Again, the Amalekites have nothing to do here. They dwell in the Negeb (Num. xiii. 29), nor have they any motive for making an expedition to attack Israel. The time for war is after Israel has left Horeb and is on its way to take possession of the land. *Then* they do indeed meet Amalek, and are put to flight (Num. xiv. 45). Moreover, the "hill" of vs. 9 f. is a perfectly blind expression in this connection; but *cf.* Num. xiv. 44. Manifestly it is after the apprenticeship of Joshua, of which we hear so much in the Horeb chapters, is over, and after Israel begins actually to threaten Amalekite territory, that we must look for the original position of this section. The expression **רֹאשׁ הַהַר הַנִּבְעָה**, vs. 9 f., has a suggestive resemblance to **רֹאשׁ הַהָרִים**, an expression twice employed in the kindred narrative of a subsequent conflict with Amalek in Num. xiv. 40-45 (E). There seems to be reason for assigning that of Ex. xvii. 8-16 to something like the same locality, if not to about the same period. Dt. xxv. 17 ff. suggests a comparatively early period in the exodus.

The E element of xvii. 1-7, on the contrary, is in place. Considerations of the convenience for the people of being supplied with water as well as food (ch. xvi.) in their desert march have little to do with it; but the mention of "the rock in Horeb," vs. 6, as an objective point, is decisive. Nor can Horeb be so readily set aside as a gloss (Jülicher). It is an essential part of E's narrative; how essential we do not apprehend until we realize (vs. 8-16 being shown to be misplaced and ch. xviii. admittedly so) that we really are brought by E in xvii. 1-7 to the point where we stand in P and J in xix. 1 f. In short, the E element of xvii. 1-7 stands in immediate connection with xix. 3 ff.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>7</sup> *Cf.* Cornill, *ZATW.*, XI. 20: "Durch die, allerdings grosse sachliche Schwierigkeiten bereitende, ausdrückliche Ortsbestimmung **עַל הַצֵּיִר בְּחֹרֵב**, vs. 6, wird unweigerlich festgestellt, dass E das Quellenwunder in die Gegend des Horeb, also auf den ersten Theil der Wanderung Israels, verlegt hat."

For Cornill's admirably acute and painstaking article on the relation of Num. xx. to Ex. xvii. 1-7 the present writer has reason to be grateful, as it affords him, together with some anticipations of what he had in mind to bring out, an analysis of Num. xx. as exhaustive as it is satisfactory. With Cornill we adopt as the narrative of P<sup>2</sup> in Num. xx., vs. 1<sup>a</sup>, 2, 3 (from **לֵאמֹר**), 4 (except **אָנַחְנוּ וּבְעִירָנוּ** = R), 6 f., 8 (except **קָח אֶת הַמָּטָה** and **וּבְעִירָם**), then from 10<sup>b</sup> [**וַיֹּמְרוּ מֹשֶׁה וְאַהֲרֹן אֶת פִּי יְהוָה וַיֹּאמְרוּ הַמֶּן הַסֵּלַע הַזֶּה נֹצֵיאַ לָהֶם מֵיִם שְׁמַעֲנוּי הַמְּרִים** then (with Professor Cornill's permission) vs. 12 and **וַיֹּאמְרוּ יְהוָה אֵל מֹשֶׁה וְאַל אַהֲרֹן שְׁמַעֲנוּי** from 10<sup>b</sup> (LXX.), as follows: **וַיֹּאמְרוּ הַמֶּן הַסֵּלַע הַזֶּה נֹצֵיאַ לָהֶם מֵיִם**: יֵעָן אֲשֶׁר מְרִיתֶם **[אֶת] פִּי וְגו' . . . לָהֶם: קָח אֶת הַמָּטָה אֲשֶׁר לִפְנֵי וְהָךְ כֹּן אֶת הַסֵּלַע**: וַיֹּצֵאוּ מֵיִם: 9, 10<sup>a</sup>, 11\*, 13.

We may further gratefully accept Professor Cornill's satisfactory demonstration that the JE elements of Num. xx. 1-13, viz. 1<sup>a</sup><sup>β</sup>, 3<sup>a</sup> (to **וַיֹּאמְרוּ**), 5, belong to J. As to the theory of a connection between this and the Meribah element of Ex. xvii. 2 and 7 and the analysis of the latter passage, it can hardly be considered satisfactory even in the reconstruction given on p. 33. In Ex. xvii. he contents himself with assigning **וַיַּחֲנוּ בְּרִפְיֵיהֶם** in vs. 1<sup>a</sup> to E (also P), 1<sup>b</sup>, 2, and 7 to J; vs. 3-6 are "ein wesentlich unversehrtes Stück aus E." The J portion is supposed to have been brought over entire by R<sup>p</sup> from Num. xx., where it originally stood in combination with J's Massah story. In the process of transportation the half verse xvii. 2<sup>a</sup> = Num. xx. 3<sup>a</sup> was duplicated.

With Cornill's judgment as to vs. 4-6 (*cf.* Ex. xiv. 10<sup>b</sup>, 15<sup>a</sup>; vii. 17, 20; xviii. 12), I am ready to coincide. That before the displacement by R of J material from Num. xx. hither, Ex. xvii. 1-7 was free from admixture of J, I am not able to admit. The theory of transportation of material when carried to this extent becomes very improbable; and one must be indeed in straits when, instead of recognizing the universal phenomenon of parallel sources in the reduplication of the key-clause "and the people strove with Moses," one assumes that the reduplication was produced by R in the process of transposition of material. No; if we find this significant clause once in Ex. xvii. and once in Num. xx., and in both cases are obliged to recognize that it is from JE and not from P, the only plausible hypothesis is that in one case it comes from J's Meribah story, in the other from E's. In the present instance Cornill has made doubly clear what was clear before, that Ex. xvii. is the original place of E's Meribah story and Num. xx. that of J's. To suggest, then, that all

that part of Ex. xvii. which contains the play upon the name Meribah is J's, transported hither by R, and that E's story was originally not localized, is to invert the probabilities. On the contrary, we have every reason to believe that xvii. 1<sup>b</sup>, 2 followed directly upon E's Massah story of ch. xvi., as it actually does when the P element is removed; and that when we have subtracted the few clauses which are manifestly from a different hand (J) in vs. 2<sup>bβ</sup> f., and 7, we shall have E's Meribah story substantially as it originally was, and in its original position, — the story of the miraculous provision of water immediately after that of the miraculous provision of food, both at the outset of the wilderness journey. Massah (ch. xvi.) and Meribah (ch. xvii.) are thus associated as they are in Dt. xxxiii. 8, not as a single place, but as two associated places, and this is always the representation of D (*cf.* Dt. viii. 15 f.; vi. 16; ix. 22).

Cornill considers that vs. 1<sup>b</sup>, 2, 7 must certainly be recognized as J's, and of one piece. But neither vs. 2 nor vs. 7 seems to me to be of uniform structure. At a pinch, the last clause of vs. 2 can be associated in thought with the rest of the verse, though it is clear that, were it not for the necessity of bringing into connection the two names Massah, Meribah, the author would not have left so much to inference. But vs. 7 is to me impossible to conceive as a uniform product of J's clear and skillful pen. That Massah and Meribah might have been to him identical localities is improbable (doubly so in view of the association Meribah-Kadesh in Num. xx.), but not impossible (see Wellhausen, *Composition*, p. 81, note); but it was at least as impossible for him as for us to conceive of Moses giving a place two different names at the same time and from the same occasion. Further, if even this were possible, we should not have the clumsy collocation of vs. 7, but something more like the touch of P<sup>2</sup> in Num. xx. 13, where Meribah-Kadesh is ætiologized. But besides this objection, the last part of vs. 7 distinctly implies a different proceeding from the narrative of vs. 2. The "striving" of Israel against Moses might be construed as a "tempting of Yahweh" (but *cf.* P<sup>2</sup> in Num. xx. 13); but to suppose that J had no other ground for the accusation which he puts in Moses' mouth of having said, "Is Yahweh among us or not?" than what can be supposed to be implied in murmuring against Moses, is too much. Verse 7<sup>b</sup> really presupposes a distinct ætiological Massah story. It is part of J's story of Israel's "tempting Yahweh" and demanding to know whether he is among them or not (*cf.* Num. xiv. 22). The

answer to this demand is, to all appearance, to be found in xix. 20-25; xxiv. 1 f., 9 f.

When we add to all this the fact that in Dt. vi. 16; ix. 22, we have the unmistakable reference of D to a distinct Massah story of J (not that of E, where "Yahweh proves Israel," Dt. xxxiii. 8; Ex. xv. 25<sup>b</sup>; xvi. 4) unconnected with Meribah, and the high probability that this Massah story of J would be located near that of E, and not at the extreme other end of the journey, where his Meribah story, from the traces in Num. xx. and the dependence of P<sup>2</sup>, must have been located, the probability increases almost to certainty that the fragments of a story of the tempting of Yahweh by Israel in xvii. 3, 2<sup>b8</sup> and part of vs. 7 are from J's Massah story, in its original place and parallel to E's in ch. xvi.

It is, in fact, necessary, if we assign vs. 2 (except the last clause) to E, to assign the doublet vs. 3 to J. So far I have said nothing of linguistic and stylistic marks because there was nothing decisive in either vs. 2 or vs. 3 as between J and E. Num. xi. 13 (J) is a good reference for Cornill's assignment of vs. 2 to J; but it certainly is by no means decisive, and to my mind is outweighed by the mere fact that vs. 4 presupposes something more violent than the "murmurs" of vs. 3. Num. xxi. 5 (E) is a good reference for Cornill's assignment of vs. 3 to E; but xiv. 11 f. and Num. xx. 5 (J) are at least as good, and we may add that xv. 27, which in J would have immediately preceded xvii. 3, is similarly constructed; xv. 24 is also worth consulting. Finally, we have seen considerable reason (JOURNAL, IX. (1890), 194) for thinking that the clause "we and our children *and our cattle*" is an indication of J of no small value.

As Professor Cornill and I are agreed in finding E's Massah story in Ex. xv. 25<sup>b</sup> ff. a "tempting," or "proving," of the people by Yahweh, the last clause of vs. 2 and 7 and the name Massah in the latter verse which belong to a parallel story of the same place, differing only in that here the people "tempt" Yahweh, must unavoidably be assigned to J. The order of 2<sup>b8</sup>, 3 has, of course, been inverted by JE', and the account of how the people "tempted" Yahweh, saying, "Is Yahweh among us or not?" (vs. 7) is missing. But we can still substantially reproduce J's Massah story, which was not a part of, but entirely separate from, his Meribah story of Num. xx.

After Ex. xv. 27 supply [And they came to Massah], then xvii. 3, "and the people thirsted there for water" [and tempted Yahweh,



saying, If Yahweh be indeed among us let him show himself and help us]; "and the people murmured against Moses, and said, Wherefore hast thou brought us up out of Egypt, to kill us and our children and our cattle with thirst?" . . . [And Yahweh shewed unto him a spring of water; and the people drank and their cattle(?)] . . . ; vs. 7 [Therefore the name of the place was called] "Massah, because they tempted Yahweh, saying, Is Yahweh among us or not?" • (*Cf.* xxxiii. 14; xxxiv. 9; Num. xi. 20.)

After vs. 5 the name of a place has perhaps been left out by JE<sup>r</sup>, as in Gen. xxxi. 25, and for a similar reason. According to our analysis it must have designated "Meribah," which may or may not have been identical with Kadesh-barnea.